



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/472,062	12/23/1999	TADASHI OHASHI	1341.1037/JD	8272
21171	7590	05/18/2006	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/472,062

Applicant(s)

OHASHI, TADASHI

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 03/20/2006 to the original application filed 12/23/1999.
2. Claims 1-11 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, and 9 have been amended. Claims 1, 6 and 9 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 and 5-11 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Serbinis et al.** (U.S. 6,584,466 – filed 04/1999) in view of **Usdin et al.** “XML: Not a Silver Bullet, But a Great Pipe Wrench”, 09/1998.

As to claims 1, 6, and 9:

Serbinis discloses an integrated document management system (*e.g., document management system; col.3, lines 14-19*) comprising:

- a storage unit (*e.g., store 30; col.5, lines 47-49*) which stores therein a document database (*e.g., database 25; col.5, lines 27-62*) comprising plurality of documents that are files (*e.g., electronic documents or files; col.5, lines 35-37*) together forming a hierarchical structure (*e.g., hierarchical storage scheme for storing electronic documents; col.7, lines 16-22*) comprising an hierarchy upper layer and hierarchy lower layer ranked below the upper the upper hierarchy layer where document files, each containing a document, in the lower hierarchy are referenced above in the upper hierarchy layer (*e.g., each document version instance 74A and 74B includes a reference to the parent; col.7, lines 47-48 and also see fig.7*), where the structure is defined with hypertext described in an extended markup language (*e.g., XML; col.16, lines 1-25*);
- a management information database comprising management information (*col.9, lines 19-32*), the document in the upper hierarchy layer is separate and distinct from the document in the lower hierarchy layer (*e.g., DMS system 17 ... supports multiple versions of documents ... maintain the relationships between the documents; col.7, lines 42-57*);
- a server connected to said storage unit (*e.g., store 30 is connected to server computer; col.5, lines 36-47 & Figs. 1A-B*) and provided a manager of the documents (*e.g., control data concerning documents; col.5, lines 27-28*); and
- a client connected via a network to said server (*e.g., one or more separate computers connected to server computer; col.5, lines 63-67*) and retrieves together, based on the management information, by accessing said server (*e.g., the electronic*

document then maybe retrieved by one or more Authorized Users ... The specific access rights granted to each Authorized Users are recorded in the document tables of DMS database 25; col.8, lines 67-col.9, line 32), the document in the upper layer and the document in the lower layer each having a specified version number from the document database (e.g., Document instance records are created when new documents or new versions of existing documents are stored to the DMS system; col.7, lines 51-54).

Serbinis does not explicitly teach “an XML file defining the hierarchical structure by indicating a relation between a document in the upper hierarchy layer and document in the lower hierarchy layer, a document type definition file describing information on a version number of each document, and a document style sheet file defining a style of each document.”

Usdin discloses an XML file defining the hierarchical structure by indicating a relation between a document in the upper layer and a document in the lower layer (*e.g., XML assumes that data are hierarchically structured ... which consist of name ‘root’ element which begins at the beginning of the document ... The hierarchical structure is fairly obvious in text documents ... a section starts ... the same level ... A section ... subsections; page 126*), a document type definition file describing information on a version number of each document (*e.g., Document Type Definition ... specify what the root element is for a document type ... define the contents of elements ... define relationships among the*

contents of various elements; page 127; right column – page 128, left column), and a document style sheet file define a style of each document (e.g., The language for stylesheets for XML documents; page 128, right column).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Usdin in the system of Serbinis because Usdin's teaching would have provided the capability for describing the structure and syntax of XML documents, and identifying all of the types of information that are needed for searching, retrieving, formatting, and tracking.

Claims 2, 7, and 10:

Serbinis discloses the management information includes information indicating a collection of a plurality of documents in a on the same layer (*e.g., Document objects 72A and 72B represent a generalized high level description of a document; col.7, lines 28-32*) and version number of the plurality of documents, and said client retrieves, based on the management information, by accessing from said server the collection of the plurality of documents in the same layer, the documents retrieved each having a specified version number, from the document database (*e.g., hierarchical storage scheme for storing electronic documents ... a generalized high level description of a document ...DMS system 17 also preferable supports multiple versions of documents ...the parent and child document instance, a version name and a unique version ID; col.7, lines 17-62 & Fig.3*).

Claims 5, 8, and 11:

Serbinis discloses the management information includes information concerning a security level corresponding to each of the plurality of documents and said server permits or inhibits retrieval of the document according the security level (*col. 7, lines 8-62 & Abstract & Fig. 2*).

4. Claims 3-4 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Serbinis et al.** in view of **Usdin et al.** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Hashimoto et al.** (U.S. 5,893,114 – filed 11/1996).

Claim 3:

The combination of Serbinis and Usdin does not explicitly disclose “*the server registers, when a document registered in the document database is updated, the updated document in the document database, and also updates the version number information in the management information concerning the document.*”

Hashimoto discloses the server registers, when a document registered in the document database is updated, the updated document in the document database, and also updates the version number information in the management information concerning the document (*e.g., the document once registered ... the document is periodically updated; col. 5, lines 15-52 & fig. 12*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hashimoto's teaching in the system of Serbinis as modified by Usdin because Hashimoto's teaching would have provided the enhanced capability for automatically storing a referred electronic document in a database and notifying new information to a user.

Claim 4:

Serbin is discloses said client sends via the network to said server retrieval information for a document that has been retrieved (*fig. 1B and the associated text*). However, the combination of Serbinis and Usdin does not explicitly disclose "*said server sends, when a document corresponding to the retrieval information is updated, updating information related to the document updated.*"

Hashimoto discloses said server sends, when a document corresponding to the retrieval information is updated, updating information concerning the updated document via the network to said client (*e.g., server is always accessed to acquire the latest document data; col.5, lines 36-45*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hashimoto's teaching in the system of Serbinis as modified by Usdin because Hashimoto's teaching would have provided the enhanced capability for

automatically storing a referred electronic document in a database and notifying new information to a user.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 03/20/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Applicant argues that *Serbinis does not storing documents in two layers, an upper layer and a lower layer* [Remarks, page 6].

In response, Serbinis teaches storing (e.g., *storing*) documents (e.g., *electronic documents*) in two layers, an upper layer and a lower layer (e.g., *a hierarchical storage schema*) [see fig.3 and col.7, lines 16-27].

b. Applicant argues that *the distinction is significant, because the present invention relates to hierarchically arranging the documents themselves, i.e., "the hierarchical structure ... indicating a relation between a document in the upper hierarchy layer and a document in the lower hierarchy layer" (claim 1, lines 9-10), while Serbinis relates to a system of hierarchically arranged pointers, where only the document instances 73A-73C appear to have a one-to-one correspondence to documents. Thus, the documents correspond to the single layer formed by the document instances 73A-73C* [Remarks, page 7].

In response, there is no difference between Serbinis and the instant application in storing documents. Serbinis does teach hierarchically arranging (*e.g., hierarchical storage schema*) the documents themselves (*e.g., for storing electronic documents*), i.e., the hierarchical structure (*e.g., a hierarchical storage schema*) ... indicating a relation between a document in the upper hierarchy layer and a document in the lower hierarchy layer (*e.g., hierarchical storage schema for storing electronic documents ...document group records may be created when logical collections of documents are stored at the same time and it is desired to maintain the relationship between the documents*) [see col.7, lines 16-57].

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Anglin et al.	U.S. Pat. No. 5,239,647	Issued: Aug. 24, 1993
Nakagawa et al.	U.S. Pat. No. 5,819,295	Issued: Oct. 6, 1998
Watkins et al.	U.S. Pat. No. 6,457,017	Issued: Sep. 24, 2002
Kumashio	U.S. Pat. No. 6,782,387	Issued: Aug. 24, 2004

7. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100